

PATENT

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 2, 2005, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication at page 4 of the Office Action that claims 15-29, and 31 are allowed.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 32

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-14, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Movshovich (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,911). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed. Claim 1, from which claims 2-9 and 11-14 depend, recites "identifying a transport packet as containing audio stream data" and "comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data." These elements are not disclosed or suggested by Movshovich.

The system of Mosvshovich uses a PID match unit to locate transport packets with matching PIDs and forwards the packets to a local header unit. Movshovich, col. 8, lines 28-30. The PID match unit compares the PID of a transport packet to a stored PID table. Movshovich, col. 8, lines 42-43. If a match is found, the transport packet is passed to the local header unit. Movshovich, col. 9, lines 16-30. Thus, the comparison performed by the PID match unit is performed on all incoming packets and not based on whether an incoming packet contains audio stream data. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Movshovich of comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Movshovich does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

PATENT

Claims 2-9 and 11-14 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Movshovich does not disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional non-obvious features.

With respect to claim 32, the claim recites "means for determining whether to enable audio stream data related to the transport packet to be received by a system or to discard the transport packet based at least in part on a comparison of a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register, wherein the comparison is in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data." As explained above, Movshovich does not disclose any means for performing a comparison of a field in a transport packet *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*. Accordingly, Movshovich fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 32.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-9, 11-14, and 32 is improper. Withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claim 10

At page 4 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Movshovich in view of Van Steenbrugge (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,062). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed with amendment. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. As explained above, Movshovich fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly Movshovich fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 10, at least by virtue of its dependence on claim 1. Further, Van Steebrugge does not remedy the deficiency of Movshovich.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to establish that Movshovich and Van Steenbrugge, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 10 is improper. Withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of the claim therefore is respectfully requested.

PATENT

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

11/28/05



Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)